



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,665	06/20/2006	Ari-Pekka Kautto	METSO-62	9104
36528	7590	06/30/2010		
STIENNON & STIENNON 612 W. MAIN ST., SUITE 201 P.O. BOX 1667 MADISON, WI 53701-1667			EXAMINER	
			EDWARDS, LAURA ESTELLE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1713	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
06/30/2010	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/596,665	<b>Applicant(s)</b> KAUTTO ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> Laura Edwards	<b>Art Unit</b> 1713

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Laura Edwards. (3)\_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Patrick Stiennon. (4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 29 June 2010.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: All in general.

Identification of prior art discussed: Pami et al (WO 00/58555) in view of Lintula et al (WO 00/63494).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Laura Edwards/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1713	
--	--

## Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

### **Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record**

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

### **Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews Paragraph (b)**

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

#### 37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,  
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

### **Examiner to Check for Accuracy**

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Discussed issues in the attached fax submitted by Applicants. Applicants contend that the instantly claimed invention is structurally distinguishable over the above cited prior art because the prior art does not provide for an insert molded rod cradle as set forth in the preamble of independent claims 8 and 15. In response, Applicants were reminded that the preamble was not given patentable weight but read more so as the intended use of the article or cradle for a coating rod. It was acknowledged that the instantly claimed invention was obvious or at least deemed within the purview of one skilled in the art in light of the cited prior art.

Applicants further noted distinguishable language different from that of the prior art in claims 14 and 21 to the slider piece being non-homogenous with [second plastic ???] material forming a bottom portion of the rod groove, the bottom portion engaging the rod, having a lower coefficient of friction than all other circumference portions. In response to the claim language, it was noted that the prior art did not use "non-homogenous" language but the prior art did suggest that two different polymeric materials could be used to make the cradle as evidenced by Parni (pg. 1, lines 26-28 and pg. 4, lines 30 to pg. 5, line 2) and Lintula provided sufficient evidence (page 5, lines 21 to page 6, line 29; page 7, lines 30 to page 8, line 3; claim 19) that the routineer in the art would use pre-molded pieces to make the cradle and integrate or join the pieces together to form the final cradle. As this was all noted in the final office action.

Applicants were advised to consider a coating device combination claim including the coating rod and the cradle (language of claim 15 being in the body of the claim) together with the language of claim 21. In addition, the coating device combination should be specific to the slider piece forming a central or bottom portion of the rod cradle,...maybe to the extent that the slider piece forms part of a liquid groove in the cradle, the liquid groove for receiving excess coating material. Regardless, the claimed invention would have to be rewritten to the combination claim and structurally distinguishable to the extent that the slider piece would not cover the entire circumference portions of the cradle which the prior art already establishes as being conventional in the art.

Without having the actual proposed claim(s) to be submitted after final, Applicants were notified that further search and/or consideration would be required before making a final determination of patentability